arXiv:1212.4684v2 [physics.gen-ph] 12 Jan 2013

Is there a "Charge - Magnet Paradox"

Tomislav Ivezić

Ruđer Bošković Institute, P.O.B. 180, 10002 Zagreb, Croatia
ivezic@irb.hr

In this paper it is shown that in the approach to special relativity which exclusively deals with four-dimensional geometric quantities (4D GQs), the invariant special relativity (ISR), there is not recently posed paradox that in a static electric field a magnetic dipole moment (MDM) is subject to a torque in some frames and not in others. In the ISR, there is no need either for the change of the Lorentz force, but as a 4D GQ, or for the introduction of some "hidden" 3D quantities. Furthermore, in the ISR, contrary to all previous approaches, an electrically neutral current-loop in its rest frame possesses not only a MDM m, but also an electric dipole moment (EDM) p and a stationary permanent magnet possesses not only an intrinsic magnetization M but also an intrinsic electric polarization P. Hence, in a static electric field, both, a current-loop and a permanent magnet experience the Lorentz force K_L and the torque N in all relatively moving inertial frames. The quantities m, p, M, P, K_L, N are the 4D GQs.

PACS numbers: 03.30.+p, 03.50.De

1. *Introduction.–* In a recent article [1] it is argued that in the presence of the magnetization $\mathbf{M}$ and the electric polarization $\mathbf{P}$ the usual expression for the Lorentz force with the 3-vectors fails to accord with the principle of relativity, because it leads to an apparent paradox involving a magnetic dipole moment (MDM) $\mathbf{m}$ in the presence of an electric field $\mathbf{E}$; in a static electric field a MDM $\mathbf{m}$ is subject to a torque $\mathbf{T}$ in some frames and not in others. In this notation all 3-vectors are designated in boldface type. In [1] it is argued that the Lorentz force should be replaced by the Einstein-Laub law, which predicts no torque $\mathbf{T}$ in all frames. In the following, we shall rely on the results and the explanations from [2]; see also references therein. In Sec. 9.1 in [2], Mansuripur's paper [1], the highlight of it [3] and the critics of it [4] are considered. In [1, 3-5], *all quantities* $\mathbf{E}$, $\mathbf{B}$, $\mathbf{P}$, $\mathbf{T}$, *etc. are the three-dimensional (3D) vectors and it is considered that their transformations* (they will be called the usual transformations (UT)) *are the relativistically correct Lorentz transformations* (LT) *(boosts).* Here, in the whole paper, under the name LT we shall only consider boosts. In Sec. 9.2 in [2], and in this paper, it is shown that in the recently developed geometric approach to special relativity (SR), i.e., in the invariant SR (ISR), in which an independent physical reality is attributed to the 4D geometric quantities (GQs) and not, as usual, to the 3D quantities, *the principle of relativity is naturally satisfied and there is no paradox.* Hence, there is no need either for the change of the expression for the Lorentz force, but as a 4D GQ, or for the introduction of some "hidden" 3D quantities. For a brief review of the ISR see, e.g., [2] and references therein. In some papers, e.g., [6-8], the ISR is called the "True transformations relativity."

In the ISR we deal either with the abstract, coordinate-free, 4D GQs, i.e., the absolute quantities (AQs), e.g., vectors (4-vectors in the usual notation) $E(x)$, $B(x)$, .. (x is the position vector), or with the 4D coordinate-based geometric quantities (CBGQs) comprising both components and *a basis*, e.g., $E = E^{\nu}\gamma_{\nu}$. The CBGQs are invariant under the passive LT. Such a 4D GQ represents *the same physical quantity* for relatively moving inertial observers. It is not the case in all usual approaches that deal with the 3D quantities and their UT or, as in the usual covariant approaches, e.g., [9], with the components of tensors, which are implicitly taken in the standard basis, see below.

In this paper, the treatment of the interaction between a static electric field and a permanent magnet will be as in Sec. 9.2 in [2], i.e., very similar to the treatments of Jackson's paradox [10] and the Trouton-Noble paradox [11, 12]. For simplicity, mainly the standard basis $\{\gamma_{\mu};\ 0, 1, 2, 3\}$ of orthonormal vectors, with γ_0 in the forward light cone, will be used. We use the term vector for the usual 4-vector, but as a 4D GQ. The $\{\gamma_{\mu}\}$ basis corresponds to the specific system of coordinates with Einstein's synchronization [13] of distant clocks and Cartesian space coordinates x^i. Using the 4D GQs it is shown, e.g., in [6] and [2] that an electrically neutral current-loop (superconducting) *in its rest frame* possesses not only a MDM m, but also an EDM p. In the second paper in [6], the incorrect quadrupole field of the *stationary* current loop from the published version is replaced by the dipole field. Similarly, it is shown in Sec. 8 in [2] that a stationary permanent magnet possesses not only an intrinsic magnetization M but also an intrinsic electric polarization P. That result was derived using the generalized Uhlenbeck-Goudsmit hypothesis from [14] according to which the connection between the dipole moment bivector D and the spin bivector $\mathcal{S}$ is given as $D = g_S S$, Eq. (59) in [2], or, in the tensor formalism, Eq. (9) in [14]. Hence, *in a static electric field, both, a current-loop and a permanent magnet experience the Lorentz force* (vector) K_L *and the torque* (bivector) N *in all relatively moving inertial frames and there is no paradox.* In this paper the presentation will be in the geometric algebra formalism, see a brief summary in Sec. 2 in [2]. Here, for the reader's convenience, we shall write all equations *only* with the CBGQs in the standard basis and not with the abstract multivectors, i.e., with the AQs. Hence, the knowledge of the geometric algebra is not required for the understanding of this presentation.

2. *3-vectors* $\mathbf{E}$, $\mathbf{B}$, $\mathbf{P}$, .. *and their UT.–* In all conventional formulations of the relativistic electrodynamics, e.g., [9], starting with Einstein [13], the UT of the 3-vectors $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$, and also $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{M}$, $\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{m}$, are considered to be the LT. These UT are given by, e.g., [9], Eq. (11.149) for $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ or Eq. (11.148) for components implicitly taken in the standard basis and for a boost along the x^1 axis they are, e.g., $B_1 = B_1'$, $B_2 = \gamma(B_2' - \beta E_3')$, $B_3 = \gamma(B_3' + \beta E_2')$. The essential feature is that *the transformed* $\mathbf{B}$ *is expressed by the mixture of* $\mathbf{B}'$ *and* $\mathbf{E}'$, *and similarly for* $\mathbf{E}$. The same holds for the UT of $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{M}$ and also for EDM $\mathbf{p}$ and MDM $\mathbf{m}$. Thus, if a permanent magnetization $\mathbf{M}'$ is viewed from a moving frame it produces an electric polarization $\mathbf{P} = \gamma\mathbf{U} \times \mathbf{M}'/c^2$. It is also argued that a neutral stationary current loop with a magnetic moment $\mathbf{m}'$ in its rest frame S', acquires an electric dipole moment $\mathbf{p} = \beta \times \mathbf{m}'/c$, if it is moving with uniform 3-velocity $\mathbf{U}$ ($\beta = \mathbf{U}/c$) relative to the laboratory frame S. It is always assumed that *in the rest frame of the neutral current loop the electric moment* $\mathbf{p}'$ *is zero,* $\mathbf{p}' = \mathbf{0}$. For more detail see Secs. 3.1 and 3.2 in [2] and references therein. It is visible, e.g., from Griffiths and Hnizdo (GH) [4], that the offending torque $\mathbf{T}$ from their Eq. (4) is obtained from the term $\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{E}$, where $\mathbf{p}$ is the induced EDM, their Eq. (3), which means that *the violation of the principle of relativity is a direct consequence of the transformations for the 3-vectors* $\mathbf{p}$ *and* $\mathbf{m}$.

In [9], the six independent components of the electromagnetic field tensor $F^{\alpha\beta}$ (only components in the standard basis) are identified to be six components of the 3-vectors $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ in *both* relatively moving inertial frames of reference, e.g., $E'^i = F'^{i0}$ and $E^i = F^{i0}$. This means that *the transformations of the components of* $\mathbf{E}$ *and* $\mathbf{B}$ *are derived assuming that they transform under the LT as the components of* $F^{\alpha\beta}$ *transform*, Eq. (11.148) in [9]. By the same procedure one finds the transformations of the components of $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{M}$ (of EDM $\mathbf{p}$ and MDM $\mathbf{m}$) simply replacing $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ by $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{M}$ ($\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{m}$) and $F^{\alpha\beta}$ by the generalized magnetization-polarization tensor $\mathcal{M}^{\alpha\beta}$ (the dipole moment tensor $D^{\alpha\beta}$). Similarly, the components of the torque 3-vector $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{F}$ and of another 3D vector $\mathbf{R}$ are identified with the "space-space" and "time-space" components respectively of the torque four-tensor $N^{\alpha\beta}$ in both relatively moving inertial frames of reference, see Cross [4] and Sec. 9.1 in [2]. This yields $T_1 = T_1'$, $T_2 = \gamma(T_2' - \beta R_3')$, $T_3 = \gamma(T_3' + \beta R_2')$ and similarly for R_i. *The components* T_i *in the moving frame are expressed by the mixture of the components of* $\mathbf{T}'$ *and of* $\mathbf{R}'$ *from the rest frame.* This causes that the components of $\mathbf{T}$ will not vanish in the S frame even if they vanish in the S' frame, i.e., that there is the "charge-magnet paradox" in all usual approaches to SR that deal with the 3-vectors or with components implicitly taken in the standard basis. The same holds for the components of the angular momentum $\mathbf{L}$ with $\mathbf{T} = d\mathbf{L}/dt$ and of another 3-vector $\mathbf{K}$ for which it is taken that they transform as the "space-space" and "time-space" components respectively of the usual covariant angular momentum four-tensor $J^{\alpha\beta}$, see [15] and Sec. 3 in [10]. Note that only the "space-space" components of $J^{\alpha\beta}$ ($\mathbf{L}$) and $N^{\alpha\beta}$ ($\mathbf{T}$) are considered to be the physical angular momentum and torque respectively, whereas the "time-space" components of $J^{\alpha\beta}$ ($\mathbf{K}$) and $N^{\alpha\beta}$ ($\mathbf{R}$) are *not* considered to be of the same physical nature as $\mathbf{L}$ and $\mathbf{T}$. However, if one does not use Einstein's synchronization but, e.g., a drastically different "radio," "r" synchronization in which there is an absolute simultaneity, then it is not possible to make the identification of the components of, e.g., the 3-vectors $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ with the components $F^{\alpha\beta}$. For the "r" synchronization, see Sec. 3.1 in [2] and references therein. In the "r" synchronization it holds that $F_r^{10} = E_1 + cB_3 - cB_2$. Hence, the same identification $E_{1r} = F_r^{10}$, as in $\{\gamma_\mu\}$ basis, yields that $E_{1r} = E_1 + cB_3 - cB_2$; the component E_{1r} in the $\{r_\mu\}$ basis (with the "r" synchronization) is expressed as the combination of E_i and B_i components from the $\{\gamma_\mu\}$ basis. This means that the usual identifications, Eq. (11.137) in [9], are meaningful *only* if the $\{\gamma_\mu\}$ basis is chosen, i.e., if the Minkowski metric is used.

3. *Vectors* E, B, P, .. *and their LT.–*It has recently been proved both in the tensor formalism and in the geometric algebra formalism [16] that *the UT of the 3-vectors* $\mathbf{E}$ *and* $\mathbf{B}$ *ARE NOT the LT and also the correct LT are derived. The correct LT always transform the 4D algebraic object representing, e.g., the electric field only to the electric field; there is no mixing with the magnetic field.* For a review see [2]. In [16], see also Sec. 5 in [2], the LT of the components E^μ (in the $\{\gamma_\mu\}$ basis) of $E = E^\mu\gamma_\mu$ are given as $E'^0 = \gamma(E^0 - \beta E^1)$, $E'^1 = \gamma(E^1 - \beta E^0)$, $E'^{2,3} = E^{2,3}$, for a boost along the x^1 axis. As mentioned above any CBGQ is unchanged under the LT, i.e., it holds that $E = E^\nu\gamma_\nu = E'^\nu\gamma_\nu' = E_r^\nu r_\nu = E_r'^\nu r_\nu'$, where the primed quantities in both bases $\{\gamma_\mu\}$ and $\{r_\mu\}$ are the Lorentz transforms of the unprimed ones; for the LT in the $\{r_\mu\}$ basis see [7]. The same LT hold for any other vector, e.g., x, B, P, M, EDM p and MDM m, the torque vectors N_s and N_t, see below, etc. A short derivation of the above LT is presented in [17] and it will be briefly repeated here. It is proved in [11] that the primary quantity for the whole electromagnetism is the bivector F. The vectors E and B are defined in terms of F and v, the velocity vector of a family of observers who measure E and B fields. We write them as the CBGQs in the $\{\gamma_\mu\}$ basis; $E = (1/c)F^{\mu\nu}v_\nu\gamma_\mu$ and $B = (1/2c^2)\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}F_{\nu\alpha}v_\beta\gamma_\mu$, with $E^\mu v_\mu = B^\mu v_\mu = 0$, only three components of E and B in any basis are independent. These definitions are mathematically correct definitions, which are first given (only in the component form) by Minkowski in Sec. 11.6 in [18] and reinvented and generalized in [16]. Obviously E and B depend not only on F but *on* v *as well.* The bivector F can be written as $F = (1/2)F^{\mu\nu}\gamma_\mu \wedge \gamma_\nu$, where $F^{\mu\nu} = (1/c)(E^\mu v^\nu - E^\nu v^\mu) + \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}v_\alpha B_\beta$ and $\gamma_\mu \wedge \gamma_\nu$ is the bivector basis. The frame of "fiducial" observers, $v = c\gamma_0$,

with the $\{\gamma_\mu\}$ basis in it, will be called the γ_0-frame. In the γ_0-frame $E^0 = B^0 = 0$ and $E^i = F^{i0}$, $B^i = (1/2c)\varepsilon^{ijk0}F_{jk}$; the same components as in, e.g., Eq. (11.137) in [9]. However, in any other inertial frame, the "fiducial" observers are moving, and $v = v^0\gamma_0 = c\gamma_0 = v'^\mu\gamma'_\mu$. For the "fiducial" observers, $v^\mu = c\gamma_0^\mu$ and $E^\mu = F^{\mu\nu}\gamma_{0,\nu}$. It is proved by Minkowski [18], and reinvented in [16], see also Sec. 5 in [2], that in the mathematically correct procedure for the derivation of the LT of E *both* F *and* the velocity vector v have to be transformed by the LT, e.g., for the LT from the γ_0-frame; $E = E^\mu\gamma_\mu = [(1/c)F^{i0}v_0]\gamma_i = E'^\mu\gamma'_\mu = [(1/c)F'^{\mu\nu}v'_\nu]\gamma'_\mu$. Hence, *the components E^μ transform by the LT again to the components E'^μ of the same electric field vector*, i.e., the above quoted LT of the components E'^μ are obtained. *The main point is that E'^μ are not determined only by $F'^{\mu\nu}$, as in all usual approaches*, e.g., Eqs. (11.147) and (11.148) in [9], *but also by v'^μ*. Similarly, $P(x)$ and $M(x)$ are determined by the bivector $\mathcal{M}(x)$ and the unit time-like vector u/c, where u is identified with bulk velocity vector of the medium in spacetime; $P = (1/c)\mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu}u_\nu\gamma_\mu$ and $M = (1/2)\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}\mathcal{M}_{\alpha\nu}u_\beta\gamma_\mu$, with $P^\mu u_\mu = M^\mu u_\mu = 0$, $\mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu} = (1/c)(P^\mu u^\nu - P^\nu u^\mu) + (1/c^2)\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}M_\alpha u_\beta$. P and M depend not only on $\mathcal{M}$ *but on u as well*, see Sec. 4 in [2]. In the same way, see [17] and Sec. 4 in [14], one finds that p and m are determined by the bivector D *and* the velocity vector of the particle u as $p = (1/c)D^{\mu\nu}u_\nu\gamma_\mu$ and $m = (1/2)\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}D_{\alpha\nu}u_\beta\gamma_\mu$, with $p^\mu u_\mu = m^\mu u_\mu = 0$. In the particle's rest frame (the S' frame) and the $\{\gamma'_\mu\}$ basis, $u = c\gamma'_0$, which yields that $p'^0 = m'^0 = 0$, $p'^i = D'^{i0}$, $m'^i = (c/2)\varepsilon^{0ijk}D'_{jk}$. Therefore p and m can be called the "time-space" part and the "space-space" part, respectively, of D. Furthermore, see [10, 12] and Secs. 9.1 and 9.2 in [2], the torque bivector N as a CBGQ is given as $N = (1/2)N^{\mu\nu}\gamma_\mu \wedge \gamma_\nu$, $N^{\mu\nu} = x^\mu K_L^\nu - x^\nu K_L^\mu$. Here, K_L is the Lorentz force vector. N is connected with the angular momentum bivector J as $N = dJ/d\tau$. The "space-space" torque $N_s = (1/2c)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu}N_{\alpha\beta}v_\mu\gamma_\nu$ and the "time-space" torque $N_t = (1/c)N^{\mu\nu}v_\mu\gamma_\nu$ are determined by N *and* the velocity vector v of a family of observers who measures N_s and N_t. It holds that $N_s^\mu v_\mu = N_t^\mu v_\mu = 0$. In the γ_0-frame, $N_s^0 = N_t^0 = 0$ and *only the spatial components* N_s^i and N_t^i remain, $N_s^i = (1/2)\varepsilon^{0ijk}N_{jk}$, $N_t^i = N^{0i}$. Both vectors N_s *and* N_t are in the same measure physical 4D torques which *taken together* are equivalent to the 4D torque N. The same consideration can be applied to the angular momentum bivector J and the angular momentum vectors J_s and J_t that are derived from J and v.

This discussion explicitly shows that from the ISR viewpoint the derivation of the transformations of the 3-vectors **E** and **B** from [9] is not mathematically correct, i.e., Eqs. (11.148), (11.149) in [9] are not the LT but the UT. The same holds for the UT of the 3-vectors **P** and **M**, **p** and **m**, **R** and **T**, **K** and **L**. Hence, from the ISR viewpoint, all "resolutions" of Mansuripur's paradox from [1, 3-5] are not relativistically correct, because they are based on the use of the 3D quantities and their UT, see Sec. 9.1 in [2]. In addition, it is worth mentioning that *all treatments from* [1, 3-5] *are meaningless if only the Einstein synchronization is replaced by the "r" synchronization.* This conclusion simply follows already from the above mentioned equations for F_r^{10} and E_{1r}.

4. With the 4D torques there is no "Charge - Magnet Paradox."-We start with the Lorentz force density k_L, $k_L = (1/c)F^{\mu\nu}j_\nu\gamma_\mu$, where the total current density vector j is $j = j^{(C)} + j^{(\mathcal{M})}$; $j^{(C)}$ is the conduction current density of the *free* charges and $j^{(\mathcal{M})} = -c\partial_\mu\mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu}\gamma_\nu$ is the magnetization-polarization current density of the *bound* charges. In the considered case it is taken that $j^{(C)} = 0$ and in $F^{\mu\nu}$ we can put that $B^\mu = 0$. Remember that according to the LT B is always $= 0$ and therefore there is no reason for the appearance of the paradox. It is visible that the expression for k_L contains two velocity vectors, v - the velocity vector of the observers who measure E and B fields and u - the velocity vector of the permanent magnet, i.e., of the electric current loop. Here, we write k_L in the S' frame, i. e., for the case that $u = v = c\gamma'_0$ and accordingly that $E'^0 = P'^0 = M'^0 = 0$. Hence, k_L as a CBGQ in the $\{\gamma'_\mu\}$ basis is $k_L = (-E'^k\partial'_0P'_k + (1/c)\varepsilon^{0jkl}E'_j\partial'_kM'_l)\gamma'_0 - E'^i(\partial'_kP'^k)\gamma'_i$. In the usual approaches with the 3-vectors and their UT, e.g., in [1] and in GH [4], the Lorentz 3-force density is zero in the S' frame; there is no γ'_0 term and there is no **P**. The components $k_L'^\mu$ correspond to the time and spatial components of f^α from Cross [4], i.e., to $f^0 = (1/c)\mathbf{E}\cdot(\partial\mathbf{P}/\partial t + \nabla \times \mathbf{M})$ and $f^i = -E^i(\nabla\mathbf{P})$. But, the components $k_L'^\mu$ are multiplied by the unit basis vectors γ'_μ, whereas the 3-vector, e.g., **E** is constructed from the components $E_{x,y,z}$ and *the unit 3-vectors* **i**, **j**, **k**. In the 4D spacetime there is no room for the 3-vectors; they cannot correctly transform under the LT.

For the sake of brevity we shall explicitly write only the results for N_s and N_t, for others see Sec. 9.2 in [2]. The torque density n is $n = (1/2)n^{\mu\nu}\gamma_\mu \wedge \gamma_\nu$, $n^{\mu\nu} = x^\mu k_L^\nu - x^\nu k_L^\mu$ and it is given by Eq. (69) in [2]. In the S' frame it is given by Eq. (70) in [2] and it is $\neq 0$, whereas in the approaches with the 3-vectors n is zero in the S' frame. In S' and S, the integrated torque N as a CBGQ is given by Eqs. (71) and (72), respectively, in [2]. It can be seen from the mentioned equations that *the 4D torque N is the same 4D GQ in all relatively moving inertial frames of reference and there is no paradox.*

Let us determine N_s and N_t, which are *both* equally well physical, as 4D CBGQs in the rest frame S'. They are

$$N_s = N_s'^\mu\gamma'_\mu = (1/c)E'^1p'^3v'^0\gamma'_2, \quad N_t = N_t'^\mu\gamma'_\mu = -(1/c^2)E'^1m'^2v'^0\gamma'_3, \tag{1}$$

where $v'^\mu = (c, 0, 0, 0)$. In the considered case, $E = E'^1\gamma'_1$, $m = m'^2\gamma'_2$ and $p = p'^3\gamma'_3$. N_t in (1) corresponds to the expression $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{m} \times \mathbf{E} = -mE\widehat{\mathbf{y}}$ in Cross [4] that describes the interaction of the magnetic moment with the electric field in the rest frame S'. (Remember that in Cross [4] the rest frame is with unprimed quantities and the motion is along the x^3 axis.) N_s in (1) does not appear in any previous paper since it emerges from the existence of the EDM p for a stationary permanent magnet. It describes the interaction of the EDM p of the stationary permanent magnet with the electric field E in the rest frame S'. In the usual formulation with the 3-vectors it would correspond to the usual 3D torque $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{E}$, but, in contrast to all previous formulations, this torque is in the rest frame S'. Then, we determine N_s and N_t in S, e.g., using the LT of *all* quantities which determine N_s and N_t in (1),

$$N_s = N_s^{\mu}\gamma_{\mu} = (1/\gamma)E^1 p^3 \gamma_2, \quad N_t = -(1/c\gamma)E^1 m^2 \gamma_3. \tag{2}$$

where the LT of E are used to derive that $E'^1 = (1/\gamma)E^1$. Observe that N_s (N_t) transforms under the LT as every vector transforms, which means that *components* $N_s'^{\mu}$ *of* N_s *transform to the components* N_s^{μ} of the same torque N_s in the S frame; *there is no mixing with the components of* N_t. These LT of the components of N_s (N_t) are obtained in the same way as the LT of B (E) are obtained, i.e., that *both* N *and* v from the definitions of N_s (N_t) are transformed by the LT. This is in a sharp contrast to the UT of the 3D torque $\mathbf{T}$ in which the transformed components T_i are expressed by the mixture of components T_k' of the 3-vector $\mathbf{T}'$ and of components R_k' of another 3-vector $\mathbf{R}'$ from the rest frame. These UT of T_i (and R_i) can be obtained in such a way that *only* N from the definitions of N_s (N_t) is transformed by the LT, *but not* the velocity of the observer v.

It is worth noting that the CBGQs $N_s'^{\mu}\gamma_{\mu}'$ and $N_s^{\mu}\gamma_{\mu}$ are *the same quantity* N_s in S' and S frames, and the same for N_t, $N_s = N_s'^{\mu}\gamma_{\mu}' = N_s^{\mu}\gamma_{\mu}$, $N_t = N_t'^{\mu}\gamma_{\mu}' = N_t^{\mu}\gamma_{\mu}$. This again shows, as in [10] and [11, 12], that *in the approach with the 4D torques* N_s *and* N_t *the principle of relativity is naturally satisfied and there is no paradox.* Observe that N_s is always determined by the interaction of the EDM p and E, whereas N_t is determined by the interaction of m and E. In this geometric approach there is no need either for the "hidden" mechanical angular momentum or for the "hidden" torque.

Let us suppose for a moment that a permanent magnet possesses only a MDM m and not an EDM p. This is as in the usual approaches, but we deal with correctly defined vectors in the 4D spacetime and with their LT and not with the 3-vectors and their UT. Then, for $p = 0$, N_s is always $= 0$ but N_t is $\neq 0$ and it is always the same 4D GQ, which means that there is no paradox. Also, as in the case with $p \neq 0$, there is no need for the "hidden" quantities.

5. *Concluding remarks.–*The preceding discussion clearly shows that, as in the case with Jackson's paradox [10] and the Trouton-Noble paradox [11, 12], Mansuripur's paradox with the torque appears because of the use of the 3D quantities and their UT. But, as seen from (1) and (2) and from the invariance of any CBGQ, there is no paradox if the 4D GQs and their LT are used. In the ISR, it is proved that there is a true agreement, independent of the chosen inertial reference frame and of the chosen system of coordinates in it, with different experiments, e.g., in the second paper in [16], the motional electromotive force, in the third paper in [16], the Faraday disc, in [11, 12], the Trouton-Noble experiment and also in [8], the well-known experiments that test SR: the "muon" experiment, the Michelson-Morley - type experiments, the Kennedy-Thorndike - type experiments and the Ives-Stilwell - type experiments. *This true agreement with experiments directly proves the physical reality of the 4D geometric quantities.* It is also shown in the mentioned papers that the agreement between the experiments and Einstein's formulation of SR [13], which deals with the synchronously defined spatial length , i.e. the Lorentz contraction, with the conventional dilation of time and also with the UT of the components of the 3-vectors $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$, is not a true agreement since it depends on the chosen synchronization. As can be seen from [7, 8], contrary to the generally accepted opinion in the conventional SR, the *relativity of simultaneity, the Lorentz contraction and the time dilation are not well-defined in the 4D spacetime.* They are not the intrinsic relativistic effects since they depend on the chosen synchronization. But, *every synchronization is only a convention and physics must not depend on conventions.*

In addition, in all usual approaches including [1, 3-5], it is supposed that Maxwell's equations with the 3-vectors, both in the vacuum and in a moving medium, are covariant under the LT. But, for the vacuum, it is proved in the third paper in [16] that it is not true, because the transformations of the 3-vectors $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ are not the LT but the relativistically incorrect UT and the Lorentz invariant field equations with E and B are presented, Eqs. (39) and (40), in that paper. Moreover, in [11], an axiomatic geometric formulation of electromagnetism in vacuum with *only one axiom*, the field equation for F is developed, Eq. (4) in [11] (Eq. (20) in [2]), or, in terms of vectors E and B, Eqs. (27-29) in [2]. Its generalization to a magnetized and polarized moving medium with $\mathcal{M}(x)$ is presented in [19], Eq. (5) in [19] (Eq. (30) in [2]). As shown in [19], if that equation is written in terms of vectors E, B and P, M it becomes Eqs. (15-17) in [19] (Eqs. (33) and (34) in [2]). These equations *comprise and generalize all usual Maxwell's equations (with 3-vectors) for moving media.* In the ISR they replace Eqs. (1-4) in [1]. Recently, in the same formulation with the 4D GQs, the constitutive relations and the magnetoelectric effect for moving media are investigated in detail in [20].

It is also argued in [1, 5] that the usual Lorentz force is incompatible with momentum conservation laws and has to be replaced by the Einstein-Laub law; all with the 3-vectors. However, for the electromagnetic momentum that correctly transforms under the LT see Secs. 4 and 5 - 5.3 in [21] (only components) and for the more general expressions with the 4D GQs see Sec. 2.6 in [11]. There, in Eqs. (37) - (47) in [11], the expressions for the stress-energy vector $T(n)$, the energy density U, the Poynting vector S and the momentum density g, the angular momentum density M

and the Lorentz force K_L are directly derived from the field equation for F. The notation is as in [11]. Furthermore, the local conservation laws are directly derived from that field equation for F and presented in Sec. 2.7 in [11]. As pointed out in [19], the generalization of these relations to a moving medium can be obtained simply replacing F by $F + \mathcal{M}/\varepsilon_0$.

In [1], it is also stated that the equation $\mathbf{F} = d\mathbf{p}/dt$ is "the relativistic version of Newton's law." Furthermore, it is claimed ".. its relativistic momentum $\mathbf{p}$ increases with time, not because of a change of velocity but because of a change of mass." However, as shown in [10] and also in the fourth paper in [16], *the equation* $\mathbf{F} = d\mathbf{p}/dt$ *with* $\mathbf{p} = m\gamma_u\mathbf{u}$ *is not the relativistic equation of motion* since, contrary to the common assertions, e.g., [9, 22], it is not covariant under the LT. Any 3D quantity cannot correctly transform under the LT; it is not the same quantity for relatively moving observers in the 4D spacetime. Instead of the equation with the 3D quantities one has to use the equation of motion with 4D geometric quantities, Eq. (10) in [10], $K = dp/d\tau$, $p = mu$, where p is the proper momentum vector and τ is the proper time. For the definition of the Lorentz force K_L, see, e.g., Eq. (63) in [2]. The quantities K (K_L), p, u *transform in the same way, like any other vector, i.e., according to the LT*, the same as the above mentioned LT of E, and not according to the UT of the 3-force $\mathbf{F}$ and the 3-momentum $\mathbf{p}$, i.e., the 3-velocity $\mathbf{u}$. Moreover, only the rest mass is well defined quantity in the 4D spacetime and thus there is not "a change of mass."

The different experiments for the detection of the electric field from a stationary current loop are discussed in Sec. 7.2 in [2]. Recently, the most promising experiments with cold ions are proposed in [23]. It is suggested in [2] that they could be also used for the detection of the electric field from a stationary permanent magnet.

The whole discussion shows that in the ISR there is no trouble with any quantity and no paradox, i.e., that the ISR is perfectly suited to the symmetry of the 4D spacetime, which is not the case with the conventional SR that deals with the 3D quantities and their UT or, as in the usual covariant approaches, e.g., [9], with components implicitly taken in the standard basis.

References

[1] M. Mansuripur, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 193901 (2012).
[2] T. Ivezić, arXiv: 1204.5137.
[3] A. Cho, Science **336**, 404 (2012).
[4] D. A. T. Vanzella, arXiv: 1205.1502; C. S. Unnikrishnan, arXiv: 1205.1080; D. J. Griffiths and V. Hnizdo, arXiv: 1205.4646; K. T. McDonald, www.physics.princeton.edu/mcdonald/examples/mansuripur.pdf; D. J. Cross, arXiv: 1205.5451; P. L. Saldanha, arXiv: 1205.6858; T. H. Boyer, arXiv: 1206.5322; M. Brachet and E. Tirapegul, arXiv: 1207.4613; Kimball A. Milton, Giulio Meille, arXiv: 1208.4826; A. L. Kholmetskii, O. V. Missevitch, T. Yarman, arXiv: 1208.5296; F. De Zela, arXiv: 1210.7344; M. Rahman, C. Mahdy, arXiv: 1211.0155.
[5] M. Mansuripur, Proc. SPIE **8455**, 845512 (2012).
[6] T. Ivezić, Found. Phys. Lett. **12,** 507 (1999); arXiv: physics/0102014.
[7] T. Ivezić, Found. Phys. **31,** 1139 (2001).
[8] T. Ivezić, Found. Phys. Lett. **15,** 27 (2002); arXiv: physics/0103026.
[9] J. D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics* (Wiley, New York, 1998), 3rd ed.
[10] T. Ivezić, Found. Phys. **36,** 1511 (2006).
[11] T. Ivezić, Found. Phys. Lett. **18**, 401 (2005).
[12] T. Ivezić, Found. Phys. **37**, 747 (2007).
[13] A. Einstein, Ann. Phys. **17**, 891 (1905).
[14] T. Ivezić, Phys. Scr. **81,** 025001 (2010).
[15] J. D. Jackson, Am. J. Phys. **72**, 1484 (2004).
[16] T. Ivezić, Found. Phys. **33,** 1339 (2003); Found. Phys. Lett. **18,** 301 (2005); Found. Phys. **35,** 1585 (2005); arXiv: 0809.5277; Phys. Scr. **82,** 055007 (2010).
[17] T. Ivezić, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 108901 (2007).
[18] H. Minkowski, Nachr. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen, 53 (1908); Reprinted in: Math. Ann. **68,** 472 (1910); English translation in: M. N. Saha and S. N. Bose *The Principle of Relativity: Original Papers by A. Einstein and H. Minkowski* (Calcutta University Press, Calcutta, 1920).
[19] T. Ivezić, arXiv: 1101.3292.
[20] T. Ivezić, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **26**, 1250040 (2012).
[21] T. Ivezić, Found. Phys. Lett. **12,** 105 (1999).
[22] D. J. Griffiths, *Introduction to Electrodynamics* 3rd ed. (Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, 1999); W. G. W. Rosser, *Classical Electromagnetism via Relativity* (Plenum, New York, 1968).
[23] R. Folman, arXiv: 1109.2586.